

Apparent universality of semiclassical gravity in the far field limit

Paul R. Anderson^{a, b*} and A. Fabbri^{b†}

^{a)} *Department of Physics, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109, USA, and*

^{b)} *Departamento de Física Teórica and IFIC, Universidad de Valencia-CSIC,
C. Dr. Moliner 50, Burjassot-46100, Valencia, Spain.*

The universality of semiclassical gravity is investigated by considering the behavior of the quantities $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b\rangle$, along with quantum corrections to the effective Newtonian potential in the far field limits of static spherically symmetric objects ranging from stars in the weak field Newtonian limit to black holes. For scalar fields it is shown that when differences occur they all result from the behavior of a single mode with zero frequency and angular momentum and are thus due to a combination of infrared and s-wave effects. An intriguing combination of similarities and differences between the extreme cases of a Schwarzschild black hole and a star in the weak field Newtonian limit is explained.

There is a long history of calculations of leading order quantum corrections to the effective Newtonian potential using Feynman diagrams for scalar and other loops in the graviton propagator [1, 2, 3, 4]. Another approach is to compute the corrections to the Newtonian potential by solving the semiclassical Einstein equations in the far field limit of a static spherically symmetric object when the quantized fields are in the Boulware state [5]. For a star in the weak field Newtonian limit this has been done for both gravitons [6] and massless scalar fields with arbitrary coupling ξ to the scalar curvature [7]. It has also been done for massless scalar fields outside of a Schwarzschild black hole [8]. In each case it was found that the leading order correction depends only on the mass of the source. The lack of dependence on the structure of the source would seem to provide evidence of some type of universality for semiclassical gravity in the far field limit. However, examination of the results for massless scalar fields in [7, 8] shows that the corrections to the Newtonian potential only agree in the cases of minimal ($\xi = 0$) and conformal ($\xi = 1/6$) coupling. Interestingly these are the only cases we know of where the corrections for a massless scalar field have been computed using the Feynman diagram technique [1, 3].

In Refs. [7, 8] the quantities $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b\rangle$ were also computed in the far field limit. The results for a Schwarzschild black hole are [8, 9]

$$\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{Sch}} = \frac{M}{24\pi^2 r^3} \quad (1a)$$

$$\langle T^a_b\rangle_{\text{Sch}} = \frac{M}{240\pi^2 r^5} \text{diag}[4, 2, -3, -3] + \frac{M}{8\pi^2 r^5} (\xi - 1/6) \text{diag}[2, -2, 3, 3] \quad (1b)$$

$$(\Phi_q)_{\text{Sch}} = \frac{M}{90\pi r^3} [2 - 15(\xi - 1/6)] \quad (1c)$$

where the quantum correction to the effective Newtonian potential is denoted by Φ_q . The differences between the results for a star in the weak field Newtonian limit [7] and a black hole are

$$\Delta\langle\phi^2\rangle = -\frac{M}{4\pi^2 r^3} \xi \quad (2a)$$

$$\Delta\langle T^a_b\rangle = -\frac{3M}{4\pi^2 r^5} \xi (\xi - 1/6) \text{diag}[2, -2, 3, 3] \quad (2b)$$

$$\Delta(\Phi_q) = \frac{M}{\pi r^3} \xi (\xi - 1/6) . \quad (2c)$$

As can be seen from Eq. (2) there is complete agreement between the results only for $\xi = 0$. For $\xi = 1/6$ there is the puzzling situation that there is no agreement for $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ yet there is agreement for $\langle T^a_b\rangle$ and Φ_q . For all other values of ξ there is complete disagreement between the two results.

To investigate the origin of these agreements and disagreements we will use the formalism of Refs. [10, 11] to compute the quantities $\Delta\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\Delta\langle T^a_b\rangle$. The quantum correction to the Newtonian potential Φ_q can be obtained by solving the semiclassical backreaction equations and thus is closely tied to the value of $\langle T^a_b\rangle$.

*anderson@wfu.edu

†afabbri@ific.uv.es

Because of Birkhoff's theorem it is well known that the geometry outside of any static spherically symmetric distribution of matter (which for simplicity we have been referring to here as a star) is the Schwarzschild geometry. The general line element for a static spherically symmetric spacetime can be written in the form

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{k(r)} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) . \quad (3)$$

For Schwarzschild spacetime $f = k = 1 - \frac{2M}{r}$, with M the mass of the black hole. For a static star, f and k will consist of different functions of r inside the star but outside of it they will be the same as for a black hole except that now M is the mass of the star.

To compute the values of $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b\rangle$ outside of a static star we make use of the method of Ref. [10, 11] which is an extension of that developed in Refs. [12]. We begin with $\langle\phi^2\rangle$. All details are given in Ref. [11].

For a static spherically symmetric spacetime the Euclidean metric is obtained using the relation $\tau = it$ with τ the Euclidean time. The Euclidean Green's function obeys the equation

$$\square_x G_E(x, x') - \xi R(x) G_E(x, x') = -\frac{\delta^4(x, x')}{\sqrt{g}} \quad (4)$$

with ξ the coupling to the scalar curvature R . Formally the real part of the Euclidean Green's function is equal to $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ in the limit the points come together. Of course G_E is divergent in this limit. If renormalization is done using the method of point splitting [13, 14] then one uses the DeWitt-Schwinger expansion to compute the renormalization counterterms which are then subtracted from G_E before letting the points come together. Writing $\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{unren}} = G_E$ one has

$$\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{ren}} = \lim_{x' \rightarrow x} [\text{Re} \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{unren}} - \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{DS}}] . \quad (5)$$

For an arbitrary separation of the points the Euclidean Green's function can be written as

$$G_E(x, x') = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\omega \cos[\omega(\tau - \tau')] \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty (2\ell+1) P_\ell(\cos\gamma) C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell}(r_<) q_{\omega\ell}(r_>) . \quad (6)$$

Here P_ℓ is a Legendre polynomial, $\cos\gamma = \cos\theta \cos\theta' + \sin\theta \sin\theta' \cos(\phi - \phi')$, and $C_{\omega\ell}$ is a normalization constant which is determined by the Wronskian condition

$$C_{\omega\ell} \left[p_{\omega\ell} \frac{dq_{\omega\ell}}{dr} - \frac{dp_{\omega\ell}}{dr} q_{\omega\ell} \right] = -\frac{1}{r(r-2M)} . \quad (7)$$

The radial modes $p_{\omega\ell}$ and $q_{\omega\ell}$ obey the mode equation

$$k \frac{d^2 S}{dr^2} + \left[\frac{2k}{r} + \frac{k}{2f} \frac{df}{dr} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dk}{dr} \right] \frac{dS}{dr} - \left[\frac{\omega^2}{f} + \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2} + \xi R \right] S = 0 \quad (8)$$

where S refers to one of the modes. Note that $p_{\omega\ell}$ is fixed by the boundary condition that it be regular either at the event horizon of the black hole or the center of the star while $q_{\omega\ell}$ is fixed by the boundary condition that it be regular in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$. Since the mode equation has the same form outside of the star as it does outside the event horizon of the black hole, $q_{\omega\ell}$ is the same for both in these regions.

When the points are split in the time direction so that the radial and angular points are the same then a high frequency version of the WKB approximation for the radial modes can be substituted into Eq. (6) to obtain the quantity $\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{WKBdiv}}$. This quantity has the same ultraviolet divergences as G_E in the limit that the points come together. If it is both added and subtracted from Eq. (5) then the result is

$$\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{ren}} = \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{numeric}} + \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{analytic}} , \quad (9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{numeric}} &= \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{unren}} - \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{WKBdiv}} \\ \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{analytic}} &= \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{WKBdiv}} - \langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{DS}} \end{aligned}$$

The quantity $\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{analytic}}$ has been computed analytically [11] in an arbitrary static spherically symmetric spacetime while $\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{numeric}}$ must usually be computed numerically.

While not truly local, $\langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{analytic}}$ is effectively local in the coordinate system we are using since it just depends on the functions f and k and some of their derivatives evaluated at a given value of the radial coordinate r . Thus this piece is exactly the same outside the event horizon of a black hole or outside the surface of a static spherically symmetric star. The quantity $\langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{numeric}}$ is explicitly nonlocal and depends on the two radial mode functions $p_{\omega\ell}$ and $q_{\omega\ell}$. In the region outside the surface of a star it is

$$\langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{numeric}} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\omega \left[\sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \left((2\ell+1) C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell}(r) q_{\omega\ell}(r) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(r-2M)}} \right) + \frac{\omega}{1-2M/r} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Our goal is to derive Eq. (2) and to use the results to understand the reasons for the agreements and disagreements discussed above between the results for a black hole and those for a static spherically symmetric star. Thus we want to compute the difference

$$\Delta \langle \phi^2 \rangle = \langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{star}} - \langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{blackhole}} \quad (11)$$

in the region exterior to the surface of the star in the case that the masses of the star and black hole are equal. Since the spacetime geometry is the same in this region for both the star and black hole, the renormalization counterterms must also be the same. Thus $\Delta \langle \phi^2 \rangle$ is explicitly finite and we expect that its value should be independent of the renormalization scheme used provided that the Wald axioms are satisfied [15]. The same applies to the change in the stress-energy tensor $\Delta \langle T_{ab} \rangle$ discussed below.

Outside of the star p_* and q_* must be linear combinations of the Schwarzschild modes p_{Sch} and q_{Sch} . As discussed above $q_* = q_{\text{Sch}}$. However, since the boundary condition for p_* is fixed at the center of the star

$$p_* = \alpha p_{\text{Sch}} + \beta q_{\text{Sch}}. \quad (12)$$

The normalization constants C_* and C_{Sch} are determined from the Wronskian condition (7) using the appropriate mode functions. Using (12) it is easy to show that

$$\alpha C_* = C_{\text{Sch}}. \quad (13)$$

Then combining Eqs. (10) - (13) one finds that

$$\Delta \langle \phi^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\omega \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty (2\ell+1) C_{\text{Sch}} \frac{\beta_{\omega\ell}}{\alpha_{\omega\ell}} q_{\omega\ell}^2. \quad (14)$$

This formula is exact. The normalization constant C_{Sch} can be determined from the asymptotic form of the Schwarzschild mode functions. At large r these mode functions approach the corresponding modes in flat space which are

$$p_{\text{flat}} = \omega^{-\ell} i_\ell(\omega r) \quad (15a)$$

$$q_{\text{flat}} = \omega^{\ell+1} k_\ell(\omega r) \quad (15b)$$

with i_ℓ and k_ℓ modified spherical Bessel Functions. Substituting into Eq. (7) gives

$$C_{\text{Sch}} = \frac{2}{\pi} \quad (16)$$

for all values of ω and ℓ .

As long as the coefficients in the mode equation (8) are finite at the surface of the star the mode functions p and q and their first derivatives are continuous there. Matching at the surface $r = A$ gives

$$\alpha = \frac{p_* q'_{\text{Sch}} - p'_* q_{\text{Sch}}}{q'_{\text{Sch}} p_{\text{Sch}} - p'_{\text{Sch}} q_{\text{Sch}}} \quad (17a)$$

$$\beta = \frac{p_{\text{Sch}} p'_* - p'_{\text{Sch}} p_*}{q'_{\text{Sch}} p_{\text{Sch}} - p'_{\text{Sch}} q_{\text{Sch}}} \quad (17b)$$

where primes denote radial derivatives, and all modes are evaluated at $r = A$. Substituting Eq. (17) into Eq. (14) shows that in general there will be corrections due to the presence of the star and that they will depend on the structure of the star since p_* does.

In the large r limit the metric goes to its flat space value and, since the boundary conditions on the modes $q_{\omega\ell}$ are imposed at $r = \infty$, these modes approach their flat space values. Thus it suffices to use the flat space values for these modes in Eq. (14). They are given in Eq. (15b) and are of the form

$$q_{\text{flat}} = \frac{\pi}{2} \omega^{\ell+1} e^{-\omega r} \left[\frac{c_1}{\omega r} + \dots + \frac{c_\ell}{(\omega r)^{\ell+1}} \right] \quad (18)$$

with $c_1 = 1$ and the rest of the constants c_i depending on the value of ℓ .

Since the integral and sum in Eq. (14) are finite the order may be interchanged. Then for a given value of ℓ the major contribution to the integral comes from small values of ω . A power series in inverse powers of r can be generated by successively integrating by parts provided that $\beta_{\omega\ell}/\alpha_{\omega\ell}$ is a regular function of ω near $\omega = 0$. It is then found that the leading order contribution comes only from the $\ell = 0$ integral and is

$$\Delta\langle\phi^2\rangle = \frac{1}{16\pi r^3} \frac{\beta_{00}}{\alpha_{00}}. \quad (19)$$

This is a remarkable simplification and works for all static spherically symmetric stars provided only that the mode functions and their first derivatives are continuous across the surface of the star, that $\beta_{\omega\ell}/\alpha_{\omega\ell}$ is at least a C^1 function of ω at $\omega = 0$, and that the geometry outside the star is the Schwarzschild geometry [16].

Using the result (19) we can show that there is no correction at leading order if $\xi = 0$. First note that if $\omega = \ell = \xi = 0$ the solution to the mode equation (8) which is regular on the event horizon of a black hole or at the center of a spherically symmetric star is $p_{00} = \text{constant}$ and without loss of generality the constant can be chosen to be 1. It follows immediately from Eq. (12) that

$$\alpha_{00} = 1, \quad \beta_{00} = 0. \quad (20)$$

Thus $\Delta\langle\phi^2\rangle = 0$ if $\xi = 0$. As shown below, this also implies that $\Delta\langle T^a_b \rangle = 0$ in this case, so the leading order behaviors of $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b \rangle$ do not depend on the type of matter present so long as it is static and spherically symmetric.

Turning to the calculation of $\Delta\langle T^a_b \rangle$, first note that, as for $\langle\phi^2\rangle_{\text{analytic}}$, we can write

$$\langle T^a_b \rangle = \langle T^a_b \rangle_{\text{numeric}} + \langle T^a_b \rangle_{\text{analytic}} \quad (21)$$

with $\langle T^a_b \rangle_{\text{analytic}}$ the same outside the surface of the star as outside the event horizon of a black hole of the same mass. The nonzero components of $\langle T^a_b \rangle_{\text{numeric}}$ are made up of linear combinations of five mode sums called $S_1 \dots S_5$ in Ref. [11]. Ignoring the subtraction terms, which are necessary for renormalization, but unnecessary for the analysis below, these sums are of the form

$$S_i = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\omega \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty (2\ell+1) s_i, \quad (22)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 &= \omega^2 C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell} q_{\omega\ell}, \quad s_2 = C_{\omega\ell} \frac{dp_{\omega\ell}}{dr} \frac{dq_{\omega\ell}}{dr}, \quad s_3 = \left(\ell + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell} q_{\omega\ell}, \\ s_4 &= C_{\omega\ell} \left[\frac{dp_{\omega\ell}}{dr} q_{\omega\ell} + p_{\omega\ell} \frac{dq_{\omega\ell}}{dr} \right], \quad s_5 = C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell} q_{\omega\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

One can find the changes in these sums ΔS_i for a static star by substituting Eq. (12) into the above expressions, using Eq. (13), and taking out the part that would be there in pure Schwarzschild spacetime. This is exactly what was done in deriving Eq. (14), which is equivalent to ΔS_5 . Operationally one simply replaces $C_{\omega\ell} p_{\omega\ell}$ by $C_{\text{Sch}} \frac{\beta_{\omega\ell}}{\alpha_{\omega\ell}} q_{\omega\ell}$ in each of the above expressions.

Then examination of Eq. (4.5) of Ref. [11] shows that in the far field limit outside of the star

$$\Delta\langle T^t_t \rangle = \left(2\xi + \frac{1}{2} \right) \Delta S_1 + \left(2\xi - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\Delta S_2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \Delta S_3 - \frac{1}{4r^2} \Delta S_5 \right) \quad (24a)$$

$$\Delta\langle T^r_r \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta S_1 + \frac{1}{2} \Delta S_2 - \frac{1}{2r^2} \Delta S_3 + \frac{2\xi}{r} \Delta S_4 + \frac{1}{8r^2} \Delta S_5 \quad (24b)$$

$$\Delta\langle T^\theta_\theta \rangle = \left(2\xi - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\Delta S_1 + \Delta S_2) + \xi \left(\frac{2}{r^2} \Delta S_3 - \frac{1}{r} \Delta S_4 - \frac{1}{2r^2} \Delta S_5 \right). \quad (24c)$$

From the definitions of the modes sums ΔS_n it is immediately clear that in general

$$\Delta S_4 = \frac{d\Delta S_5}{dr} . \quad (25)$$

To go further note that since both in the case of a black hole and a star $\langle T^a_b \rangle \sim 1/r^5$ examination of Eqs. (24) shows that these mode sums in the far field limit go like

$$\Delta S_1 = \frac{C_1}{r^5} , \Delta S_2 = \frac{C_2}{r^5} , \Delta S_3 = \frac{C_3}{r^3} , \Delta S_4 = \frac{C_4}{r^4} , \Delta S_5 = \frac{C_5}{r^3} . \quad (26)$$

Substituting into Eq. (25) gives

$$C_4 = -3C_5 . \quad (27)$$

If the radial derivative of ΔS_4 is computed and Eqs. (8) and (27) are used, then to leading order one finds

$$C_2 = -C_1 - C_3 + \frac{13}{4}C_5 . \quad (28)$$

Following the same procedure for ΔS_2 gives

$$C_2 = 5C_1 + 3C_3 - \frac{3}{4}C_5 . \quad (29)$$

Eqs. (28) and (29) can be combined to obtain the relations

$$C_2 = \frac{1}{2}C_1 + \frac{9}{4}C_5 , \quad C_3 = -\frac{3}{2}C_1 + C_5 . \quad (30)$$

This appears to be as far as one can go with this type of constraint. However, it is possible to go further for the specific leading order form of the mode sums. From Eq. (23) it is clear that the only difference between ΔS_1 and ΔS_5 is that the integrand of the former has an extra factor of ω^2 . When the same procedure is followed for computing the leading order contribution to ΔS_1 that was followed for computing the leading order contribution for $\Delta\langle\phi^2\rangle = \Delta S_5$, the only difference is a factor of $1/2r^2$ arising from the difference between $\int_0^\infty d\omega \exp(-2\omega r)$ and $\int_0^\infty d\omega \omega^2 \exp(-2\omega r)$. Thus one finds that $C_1 = C_5/2$. Using Eq. (19) to obtain C_5 the final result is

$$C_5 = 2C_1 = \frac{2}{5}C_2 = 4C_3 = -\frac{1}{3}C_4 = \frac{\beta_{00}}{16\pi\alpha_{00}} . \quad (31)$$

If Eqs. (26) are substituted into Eqs. (24) and the relations (31) are used then it is found that to leading order

$$\Delta\langle T^a_b \rangle = \frac{3\beta_{00}}{16\pi\alpha_{00}r^5} (\xi - 1/6) \text{diag}[2, -2, 3, 3] . \quad (32)$$

This immediately shows that for $\xi = 1/6$ the leading order contributions to the components of $\Delta\langle T^a_b \rangle$ are zero even if the leading order contributions to the mode sums $\Delta S_1 \dots \Delta S_5$ are nonzero in this case. Moreover, from Eq. (20) it follows that when $\xi = 0$, $\Delta\langle T^a_b \rangle$ vanishes.

As discussed in the introduction and shown explicitly in Eq. (2), there is agreement between the leading order behaviors of $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ in the case $\xi = 0$ and of $\langle T^a_b \rangle$ in the cases $\xi = 0, 1/6$. These results provide a mathematical explanation for these agreements.

A potential weak point in the above derivation of the corrections to $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b \rangle$ is the assumption that β_{00}/α_{00} is a C^1 function of ω at $\omega = 0$. We do not have a proof of this, but we have numerically computed the full corrections for the case of constant density stars. A previous calculation was done in Ref. [17] “using the approximation developed by Page, Brown and Ottewill” [18]. We have obtained the leading order behaviors of the full numerical corrections to both $\langle\phi^2\rangle$ and $\langle T^a_b \rangle$ in the far field limit [19]. We have also computed these corrections by numerically computing the quantity β_{00}/α_{00} which is given in Eq. (17), and substituting the result into Eqs. (19) and (32). In every case considered there is agreement between these calculations to within the expected numerical error.

Next we consider the weak field limit. For the metric (3) this means that we can write $f = 1 + \delta f$, $k = 1 + \delta k$ with $|\delta f|$, $|\delta k|$ and their derivatives assumed to be small. If we write $p_* = p_{\text{flat}} + \delta p$, to first order in small quantities the mode equation for the case $\omega = \ell = 0$ becomes

$$\frac{d^2\delta p}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{d\delta p}{dr} = -(\delta k) \frac{d^2 p_{\text{flat}}}{dr^2} - \left(\frac{2\delta k}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\delta f}{dr} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\delta k}{dr} \right) \frac{dp_{\text{flat}}}{dr} + \xi R p_{\text{flat}} . \quad (33)$$

Note that the derivative terms on the right hand side vanish because $p_{\text{flat}} = 1$. Then the solution to the equation which has the correct boundary condition at $r = 0$ is

$$\delta p = \xi \int_0^r \frac{dr_1}{r_1^2} \int_0^{r_1} dr_2 r_2^2 R(r_2) . \quad (34)$$

In the weak field limit the geometry must be nearly flat everywhere. Thus at the surface of the star

$$p_{\text{Sch}} = p_{\text{flat}} + \delta p_{\text{Sch}} , \quad q_{\text{Sch}} = q_{\text{flat}} + \delta q_{\text{Sch}} . \quad (35)$$

For the $\omega = \ell = 0$ mode $p_{\text{Sch}} = 1$ so $\delta p_{\text{Sch}} = 0$ [20]. Substituting Eqs. (34) and (35) into Eq. (17) and then substituting the result into Eq. (19) one finds to first order that

$$\Delta \langle \phi^2 \rangle = -\frac{\xi}{8\pi^2 r^3} \int_0^A dr r^2 R(r) . \quad (36)$$

Einstein's equations can be used to write $R = 8\pi(\rho - p_r - 2p_\theta)$ with ρ the density, p_r the radial component of the pressure and p_θ its angular component. Thus the leading order correction in the weak field limit depends on the equation of state of the matter that makes up the star. In the Newtonian limit the pressure becomes negligible compared to the density and one finds

$$\Delta \langle \phi^2 \rangle = -\frac{\xi M}{4\pi^2 r^3} . \quad (37)$$

This shows that the correction now depends only upon the mass of the star. Finally, using this result for ΔS_5 in Eqs. (26) and (31) one finds

$$\Delta \langle T^a_b \rangle = -\frac{3M}{4\pi^2 r^5} \xi (\xi - 1/6) \text{diag}[2, -2, 3, 3] \quad (38)$$

Comparison with Eqs. (2) shows that in the weak field Newtonian limit our results (37) and (38) are in complete agreement with those of Ref. [7].

One can ask what would happen for other fields. Massless spin 1/2 and spin 1 fields are conformally invariant so it is reasonable to expect that the apparent conformal symmetry, which apparently causes the leading order terms in the stress-energy to be the same for a star or black hole for the conformally invariant scalar field, will lead to the same result for these fields. Since gravitons are not conformally invariant it is not clear what the relationship between the stress-energy of gravitons outside of a star and outside of the event horizon of a black hole will be.

For massive fields the mass provides an infrared cutoff. If we consider massive scalar fields with arbitrary curvature couplings the derivation up to Eq. (14) is the same. However, in Eqs. (15) and (18) ω is replaced by $\Omega = \sqrt{\omega^2 + m^2}$, with m the mass of the field. It is easy to show that in this case the corrections are exponentially suppressed. One would expect the same behavior for massive fields of higher spin.

Our results show that, in general, there is a distinction between the far field limit for a strongly gravitating source of matter, a weakly gravitating source of matter, and matter which can be treated in the Newtonian limit, even if the leading order result for the latter case depends only upon the mass of the star. Nevertheless in most cases of physical interest the leading order contributions to the stress-energy for scalar fields and probably for fields of higher spin (except possibly gravitons) are independent of the type of matter or its configuration so long as it is spherically symmetric. This leads to an apparent universality in the quantum corrections these fields make to the effective Newtonian potential.

We thank A. Akhundov, R. Balbinot, S. Fagnocchi, F. D. Mazzitelli, J. Navarro-Salas, and M. Rinaldi for discussions. We would also like to thank the Physics Department at the University of Bologna for hospitality. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant number PHY05-56292, the Spanish grant FIS2005-05736-C03-03 and the EU Network MRTN-CT-2004-005104. P.R.A. acknowledges the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia for financial support.

-
- [1] M. J. Duff, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 1837 (1974); M.J. Duff and J.T. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2052 (2000).
 - [2] J.F. Donoghue, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 2996 (1994); *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 3874 (1994).
 - [3] H.W. Hamber and S. Liu, *Phys. Lett.* **B357**, 51 (1995).

- [4] More references can be found in: A. Akhundov and A. Shiekh, *A review of leading quantum gravitational corrections to Newtonian gravity*, gr-qc/0611091.
- [5] D. G. Boulware, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 1404 (1975).
- [6] D. A. R. Dalvit and F. D. Mazzitelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 084018 (1999).
- [7] A. Satz, F.D. Mazzitelli and E. Alvarez, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 064001 (2005).
- [8] P.R. Anderson, R. Balbinot and A. Fabbri, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 061301 (2005).
- [9] The computations of [8] involve the quantity $\langle \phi^2 \rangle$, although its value is not reported in that paper.
- [10] P.R. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 1152 (1990).
- [11] P.R. Anderson, W.A. Hiscock and D.A. Samuel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1739 (1993); *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 4337 (1995).
- [12] P. Candelas and K.W. Howard, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 1618 (1984); K. W. Howard and P. Candelas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 403 (1984); K. H. Howard, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 2532 (1984).
- [13] B. DeWitt in *Relativity Groups and Topology*, edited by B. S. DeWitt and C. De Witt (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965); *Phys. Rep.* **19**, 295 (1975).
- [14] S. M. Christensen, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2490 (1976).
- [15] R. M. Wald, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **54**, 1 (1977).
- [16] It seems likely that this could be extended to static spherically symmetric stars with a nonzero electric charge, in which case the geometry outside the star would be the Reissner-Nordström geometry.
- [17] W.A. Hiscock, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 2142 (1988).
- [18] D.N. Page *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 1499 (1982); M.R. Brown and A.C. Ottewill, *Phys. Rev. D* **31**, 2514 (1985); M.R. Brown, A.C. Ottewill and D.N. Page, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2840 (1986).
- [19] As was mentioned in Ref. [8] the analytic approximations in [11, 18] give a leading order behavior of the stress energy for the Boulware state in Schwarzschild spacetime proportional to M^2/r^6 .
- [20] P. Candelas, *Phys. Rev. D* **21**, 2185 (1980).